

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 12, and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the current amendments may be found at least at the Specification, Paragraph 23. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

At page 2, paragraph 3 of the Office Action claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 15, 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by United States Patent Number (USPN) 6,327,242 (“Amicangioli et al.”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 12, and 15 in order to expedite prosecution on the merits.

Applicant respectfully submits that to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. *See* MPEP § 2131, for example. Applicant submits that Amicangioli et al. fails to teach each and every element recited in claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-11 and 15-16 and thus they define over Amicangioli et al.. For example, with respect to amended independent claim 1, Amicangioli et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest, among other things:

at least one switch to connect to said control circuit, said switch to receive said switch control signal and a component signal and operate in accordance with said switch control signal, wherein said isolation circuit is implemented as a part of a management module within a shelf comprising a plurality of shelf components,

with said switch to prevent communication of said component signal when said switch is in an open state and said component signal to be shared among shelf components communicating within said shelf through said management module when said switch is in a closed.

In contrast, Amicangioli et al. discloses:

In a first mode, referred to as the operational mode, traffic is routed through the server 20 by placing the switches 14 in the position "A" labeled in FIG. 1. In other words, in the operational mode, message traffic arriving on port 12-1 is routed to port 12-2 and then to the server 20. Similarly, traffic arriving on the port 12-4 is routed to port 12-3 and up to the server 20. Furthermore, outgoing traffic from the server 20 received on port 12-2 is routed to port 12-1, and likewise, outgoing traffic from server 20 received on port 12-3 is routed to port 12-4. (Col. 4, lines 21-31).

In view of the above, Amicangioli et al. clearly fails to disclose at least a shelf, a plurality of shelf components, and the sharing of a signal among shelf components when said switch is in a closed state. Consequently, Amicangioli et al. fails to teach or suggest all the elements or features of the amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claim 1 as well as dependent claims 2-6, by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Claims 7 and 15 recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 15 are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of Amicangioli et al. for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 7 and 15 as well as dependent claims 8-11 and 16-20, by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

At page 7, paragraph 3 claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amicangioli et al. in view of USPN 5,388,032 ("Gill et al."). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Amicangioli et al. and Gill et al., whether taken alone or in combination, are insufficient to render obvious claim 12, as amended. Claim 12 recites features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, even if Amicangioli et al. and Gill et al. could be combined, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would fail to teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is non-obvious and is patentable over Amicangioli et al. and Gill et al., for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1 above.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claim 12 as well as dependent claims 13 and 14 by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-20 recite novel and non-obvious features which are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination. Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

It is believed that claims 1-20 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present patent application.

Respectfully submitted,
KACVINSKY LLC



Robert V. Racunas, Reg. No. 43,027
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: June 20, 2007

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102
Wexford, PA 15090
(724) 933-5529